

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA**

BEATRICE HUDSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

CITY OF OMAHA,

Defendant.

CASE NO. 8:10CV451

**MEMORANDUM
AND ORDER**

This matter is before the court on its own motion. The court dismissed Plaintiff's claims without prejudice on May 12, 2011, and entered judgment against her. (Filing Nos. [21](#) and [22](#).) Plaintiff filed a timely Notice of Appeal on June 10, 2011. (Filing No. [23](#).) Plaintiff is a nonprisoner who was previously granted leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this matter. (Filing No. [6](#).) As set forth in [Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 24\(a\)\(3\)](#):

(a) Leave to Proceed in Forma Pauperis . . .

(3) Prior Approval. A party who was permitted to proceed in forma pauperis in the district-court action, or who was determined to be financially unable to obtain an adequate defense in a criminal case, may proceed on appeal in forma pauperis without further authorization, unless:

(A) the district court—before or after the notice of appeal is filed—certifies that the appeal is not taken in good faith or finds that the party is not otherwise entitled to proceed in forma pauperis. In that event, the district court must state in writing its reasons for the certification or finding . . .

The court finds that because Plaintiff proceeded IFP in the district court, she may now “proceed on appeal in forma pauperis without further authorization.”

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that:

1. On the court's own motion, Plaintiff is granted leave to proceed on appeal in forma pauperis; and

2. The Clerk of the court shall provide the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals with a copy of this Memorandum and Order.

Dated this 8th day of July, 2011.

BY THE COURT:

s/Laurie Smith Camp
United States District Judge

*This opinion may contain hyperlinks to other documents or Web sites. The U.S. District Court for the District of Nebraska does not endorse, recommend, approve, or guarantee any third parties or the services or products they provide on their Web sites. Likewise, the court has no agreements with any of these third parties or their Web sites. The court accepts no responsibility for the availability or functionality of any hyperlink. Thus, the fact that a hyperlink ceases to work or directs the user to some other site does not affect the opinion of the court.